REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 14, 2005. Claims 1, 3, 6-10, 12, 15-19, 21, 24-28, 30-43, and 57-60 are presented for examination. Claims 4, 5, 13, 14, 22, and 23 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 1, 3, 6, 10, 12, 15, 19, 24, 28, 30, and 32-43 have been amended to define more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Claims 57-60 have been added to provide Applicants with a more complete scope of protection. Claims 1, 10, 19, 28, and 32-43 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 37, 39, 41, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,889,952 ("Hunnicutt").

Claim 37 recites, *inter alia*, receiving means for receiving an operation request for a computer resource of the information processing apparatus from a process of the terminal, intercepted by the terminal, before the computer resource of the information processing apparatus is accessed via an operating system of the information processing apparatus.

Hunnicutt relates to an access-check system between a network server and a client, in which after a request from the client is made, the server checks an access-cache to determine if access can be granted. As acknowledged in the Office Action, Hunnicutt does not teach or suggest intercepting a request between a process and an operating system. Thus, Hunnicutt does not teach or suggest the receiving means recited in Claim 37.

Accordingly, Claim 37 is believed to be patentable over Hunnicutt.

Independent Claims 39, 41, and 43 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 37 and therefore are also believed to be patentable over Hunnicutt for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 12, 13, 15, 19, 21, 22, 24, 28, 31-36, 38, 40, 42, and 43[1/] were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Hunnicutt in view of U.S. Patent 5,809,230 ("Pereira"). Claim 30 has been rejected as obvious over Hunnicutt in view of Pereira and U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0028653 ("New"). Claims 5, 7-9, 14, 16-18, 23, and 25-27 have been rejected as obvious over Hunnicutt in view of Pereira and U.S. Patent 5,550,968 ("Miller").

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a storing step of storing a management table in a storage medium, wherein the management table provides, for each computer resource managed by the operating system, access right information representing access rights for outputting each computer resource to another computer resource, and conditions under which the access right is validated. Claim 1 further recites an interception step of intercepting an operation request for a computer resource from a process, before the operation request is transferred to the operating system.

As discussed above, Hunnicutt does not teach or suggest intercepting a request between a process and an operating system, and the Examiner turns to Pereira with respect to this feature.

1/Because Claim 43 is not discussed in the remarks relating to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Applicants assume that it is rejected only under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Pereira relates to a system for controlling user access to program files and directories on a personal computer. The system controls access for particular users by creating "restricted lists for the groups, programs, directories, and ports . . . associated with a user's identifier." (Col. 9, lines 44-46). These lists are used "to delete references to [restricted] files from the system files." (Col. 9, lines 55-56). In other words, Pereira simply deletes the program folders and icons the user is not authorized to access. The computer then displays "only group folders and program icons . . . which were not deleted at user sign on." (Col. 9, lines 60-61). Pereira also monitors calls to the dynamic exchange environment (DDE) "to prevent the restoration of deleted resources to the system files by a user." (Col. 9, lines 62-64).

Even if Pereira is deemed to disclose "an interception step of intercepting an operation request for a computer resource from a process," nothing has been found or pointed out in Pereira that would teach or suggest "storing a management table in a storage medium, wherein the management table provides, for each computer resource managed by the operating system, access right information representing access rights for outputting each computer resource to another computer resource, and conditions under which the access right is validated," as recited in Claim 1.

The use of such a management table, results in a highly sophisticated access control system (see, e.g., page 34, line 19 through page 35, line 22 and Figure 3 of the specification). For example, the system allows control, for each computer resource, of "a right to move a file to another medium, a right to copy to another medium, a right to print,

a right to write to a shared memory (e.g., the clipboard for Windows), a right to capture the screen," etc. (page 35, lines 15-18). Such capabilities are not even contemplated in Pereira.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is believed to be patentable over the combination of Hunnicutt and Pereira, assuming such combination would even be permissible.

Independent Claims 10, 19, 28, and 32-36, 38, 40, and 42 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1 and therefore are also believed to be patentable over the combination of Hunnicutt and Pereira for the reasons discussed above.

A review of the other art of record, including New and Miller, has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl B. Wischhusen
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 43,279

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 551891v1